

NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Office of the Board of Regents

Chancellor

**Comprehensive Executive Performance
Annual Evaluation Report**

Prepared for the Board of Regents

June 2026

Executive Summary

The annual evaluation of Chancellor Matt McNair was conducted with input from Board members (9 out of 12 chose to take part), institution Presidents, and senior system staff in compliance with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, Title 1, Article VII, Section 3 and NSHE Procedures and Guidelines Manual, Chapter 2, Section 2, Subsections 4-5. This evaluation report reflects the factual assertions and comments of stakeholders which have not been materially altered for purpose of this record.

This evaluation reflects a mixed overall assessment of the Chancellor's performance, with the strongest support concentrated in external relationship-building, personal accessibility, and responsiveness, and the strongest concerns centered on internal leadership, workplace culture, role clarity, communication consistency, and engagement in Board governance processes. Across the record, stakeholders frequently describe a leader who is visible, personable, and effective in one-to-one or external settings, but less effective in translating those strengths into consistent internal management, institutional alignment, and system-wide execution.

The quantitative results reinforce this pattern. Five quantitative questions were asked with a value of 1-5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest. The overall average score across all quantitative responses is 2.78, with the lowest category score in balancing internal administrative responsibilities with external engagements at 2.53, and the highest category score in fostering a positive and productive work culture at 3.16, though that category remains mixed when viewed alongside the qualitative comments. The full record therefore supports an overall conclusion of stronger external than internal effectiveness, with meaningful leadership assets but substantial development needs in administration, governance, and organizational trust.

The Chancellor has identifiable assets that could support long-term success, but meaningful improvement is needed in governance engagement, organizational management, strategic clarity, and trust-building if those assets are to translate into stronger system-wide performance.

Evaluation Context and Method

This report is based on three source sets: qualitative stakeholder responses to 11 open-ended questions, supplemental stakeholder input, and quantitative responses across five performance statements. The analysis gives greater weight to recurring themes that appeared across multiple respondents and distinguishes between broadly shared concerns and isolated viewpoints.

The quantitative analysis excludes any score of 0, which was treated as not applicable. Because the source materials do not identify each response by stakeholder category in a systematic way, any stakeholder-group conclusions are based on the content and perspective reflected in the comments rather than on a fully coded respondent file.

Overall Stakeholder Sentiment

Overall sentiment is mixed but trends negative on internal organizational leadership and positive to mixed on external visibility and interpersonal accessibility. Stakeholders most consistently praise the Chancellor for being responsive, easy to reach, personable, supportive in direct interactions, and active in external engagement and relationship-building efforts. At the same time, a substantial number of respondents question whether he fully understands the scope of the role, the operational realities of NSHE, and the level of direct internal leadership expected of the Chancellor.

The most persistent concern is imbalance. Many respondents believe the Chancellor has devoted disproportionate time and energy to external relationships, visibility, and fundraising-related activity while not spending enough time learning, managing, and stabilizing internal operations. This concern is echoed in the quantitative data, where the lowest-rated statement concerns the balance of internal administrative responsibilities and external engagements.

Quantitative Analysis

The five quantitative questions produce the following category averages. The value score of 1-5 was used for each question and any question that did not receive a score (N/A) was not calculated.

Quantitative Item	Average Score	Observations
The Chancellor demonstrates a clear understanding of the responsibilities and expectations of the role.	2.92	Mixed ratings, with responses ranging from low to moderately positive.
The Chancellor effectively communicates priorities, decisions, and institutional direction.	2.62	Consistent with qualitative concerns about clarity and consistency.
The Chancellor provides strong and consistent leadership to advance NSHE goals.	2.69	Indicates concerns with leadership consistency.
The Chancellor fosters a positive and productive work culture within the organization.	3.16	Highest average and tempered by substantial negative comments on trust and morale.
The Chancellor allocates appropriate time and attention to internal administrative responsibilities versus external engagements.	2.53	Lowest-rated category and a major theme across stakeholder comment.
Overall Average Score	2.78	Overall quantitative picture suggests concerns across different dimensions.

The quantitative pattern aligns closely with the narrative record. Ratings do not suggest uniform dissatisfaction, but they do indicate broad concern in areas tied to the failure to balance internal administrative responsibilities and external engagements, communication, and consistent execution.

Stakeholder Sentiment by Perspective

Board and governance perspectives

Governance-oriented comments indicate concern that the Chancellor has not established a sufficiently active or authoritative presence in Board of Regents meetings. Several respondents characterize him as quiet, minimally participative, or too reliant on staff to answer questions, while a smaller number believe he is attentive and appropriately engaged. Even among more favorable comments, the expectation remains that the Chancellor should be more visible as a strategic voice and principal system leader in the Board setting.

Internal system administration perspectives

Internal comments are the most critical overall and are especially focused on workplace culture, management structure, trust, communication, and use of institutional knowledge. Several respondents describe the current environment as disconnected, reactive, fragmented, or fear-based, and some express concern that hiring, firing, and operational decisions are not sufficiently grounded in policy, procedure, or established practice. There is also recurring concern that the system office lacks a stable operating structure linking leadership priorities to execution capacity.

Institutional and presidential perspectives

Comments reflecting institution-level perspectives are mixed. Stakeholders acknowledge regular meetings, outreach, and relationship-building with presidents and institutions, but some question whether these engagements are translating into broader institutional support, coherent system priorities, or equitable focus across the system. Several comments suggest that some institutions or issues receive more attention than others, leading to perceptions of uneven oversight.

Evaluation by Performance Criterion

1. Relations with the Board of Regents

Overall Assessment: Mixed to weak.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Many respondents believe the Chancellor is not sufficiently active, forthcoming, or directive in Board meetings.

Rating Assessment: No direct quantitative item measures Board relations, but related comments are predominantly critical.

Key Strengths

- Demonstrates awareness of meeting agendas in some instances.
- Some respondents view him as attentive and properly engaged.

Areas for Improvement

- Speak more often and with greater authority in Board meetings.
- Provide more proactive updates and strategic framing to Regents.
- Reduce visible reliance on staff for core leadership responses.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Respondents described “no engagement,” “minimal engagement,” and the view that he “should be leading conversations specific to system agenda items”.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

2. Relations with NSHE Institutions, including Presidents

Overall Assessment: Mixed.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: The Chancellor is seen as engaged with presidents and institutional leaders, but many respondents believe this engagement lacks consistency, breadth, or operational follow-through.

Rating Assessment: No direct quantitative item isolates this category.

Key Strengths

- Maintains communication with presidents and institutions.
- Creates opportunities for coordination and shared discussion.
- Is viewed by some as aligned around shared goals and missions.

Areas for Improvement

- Engage all institutions more consistently.
- Strengthen supervision, support, and accountability for presidents.
- Translate discussions into clearer outcomes and priorities.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Stakeholders noted a “regular cadence of meetings,” but also concerns that the Chancellor is not providing consistency with plan execution and may be “hyper focused” on some areas with leaders or institutions.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

3. Relations with the Executive Branch

Overall Assessment: Moderately positive, with limited direct evidence.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Respondents acknowledge his external engagement, but the comments do not provide substantial direct evidence of outcomes.

Key Strengths

- Visible in external and governmental spaces.
- Seen as willing to engage policy makers and public officials.

Areas for Improvement

- Better demonstrate how executive-branch engagement benefits system priorities.

Evidence Level: Limited Evidence.

4. Relations with the Legislative Branch

Overall Assessment: Limited evidence, generally constructive.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Comments imply the need for stronger alignment and communication in advance of legislative priorities and sessions.

Key Strengths

- External visibility and relationship-building may support legislative engagement.

Areas for Improvement

- Share plans more transparently and align system stakeholders ahead of legislative activity.

Evidence Level: Limited Evidence.

5. Administrative and Management System-Wide Responsibilities

Overall Assessment: Weak to mixed.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: This is one of the most criticized areas in the record. Respondents repeatedly point to excessive external focus, overreliance on delegation, unstable internal structure, and limited operational command of system functions.

Rating Assessment: The quantitative item on leadership to advance NSHE goals averages 2.69, while the internal versus external balance item averages 2.53, reinforcing concerns in this category.

Key Strengths

- Has made efforts to build a team and introduce new capacity.
- Some respondents believe he is trying to modernize or reposition the system.

Areas for Improvement

- Improve internal oversight and execution discipline.
- Stabilize operational structure and connect priorities to capacity.
- Reduce fragmentation and reactive management patterns.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Comments describe the organization as “reactive and fragmented” and state that leadership priorities are not consistently connected to execution capacity.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

6. Administration of the Chancellor’s Office and Related Activities

Overall Assessment: Weak.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Comments repeatedly identify turnover, distrust, poor morale, policy concerns, and internal division as major issues within the Chancellor’s office and its surrounding operations.

Rating Assessment: The culture-related quantitative item averages 3.16, which is the highest among the five items but remains only moderately positive and is in tension with many strongly negative comments.

Key Strengths

- Some respondents credit thoughtful hiring, empowerment, and an open-door approach.
- A minority of respondents say they feel heard and valued in direct interactions.

Areas for Improvement

- Improve morale and trust.
- Align personnel decisions with policy and established procedures.
- Increase collaboration across executive and non-executive staff.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Additional comments describe the culture as “fear based,” raise concerns about hiring and firing practices, and reference a divide between leadership groups and broader staff.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

7. Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Abilities

Overall Assessment: Mixed to weak.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Some respondents see thoughtfulness, willingness to listen, and a broad perspective, but many say the Chancellor does not consistently convert discussion into decisions, execution, or stable priorities.

Rating Assessment: Related quantitative leadership and communication items average 2.69 and 2.63, respectively.

Key Strengths

- Viewed by some as thoughtful, organized, and solution oriented.
- Demonstrates openness in direct conversations with some stakeholders.

Areas for Improvement

- Set clearer priorities and follow through on them.
- Demonstrate firmer decision-making authority.
- Avoid launching new initiatives before prior work is stabilized.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Respondents noted that he “avoids making a decision,” that there are “no real discussions that lead into an executable plan,” and that new priorities often emerge before previous work is completed.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

8. Relations with External Communities

Overall Assessment: Strong relative to other categories.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: External relations are one of the Chancellor’s clearest strengths, with repeated positive references to networking, visibility, fundraising orientation, and relationship-building.

Key Strengths

- Highly visible externally.
- Effective in making connections and supporting partnerships.
- Seen as bringing a fundraising and outreach orientation that is new or useful in some contexts.

Areas for Improvement

- Better connect external engagement to internal organizational benefit.
- Ensure external focus does not overshadow internal leadership responsibilities.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Respondents described him as personable, a good networker, supportive of partnerships, and active in fundraising-related efforts.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

9. State, Regional, and National Relations

Overall Assessment: Limited evidence overall, with more support for state-level visibility than for regional or national impact.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: The comments support the conclusion that the Chancellor is externally visible and active, but they do not provide enough detail to evaluate regional or national influence comprehensively.

Key Strengths

- Statewide visibility and outreach.
- Some evidence of efforts to leverage resources for the state and system.

Areas for Improvement

- Clarify the outcomes and strategic value of broader external engagement.

Evidence Level: Limited Evidence.

10. Implementation of Board-Approved Strategic Goals

Overall Assessment: Mixed to weak.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: Respondents repeatedly ask for clearer priorities, stronger strategic planning, better articulation of goals, and more consistent execution.

Rating Assessment: Related quantitative items on communication and leadership average 2.69 and 2.62, indicating moderate but limited confidence in strategic execution.

Key Strengths

- Some stakeholders believe he has vision and is trying to move the system forward.

- There is some support for his interest in new ideas, fundraising, and broader system positioning.

Areas for Improvement

- Define priorities more clearly.
- Establish measurable plans and expectations.
- Communicate what success looks like across the organization.

Representative Stakeholder Feedback

- Respondents asked for clearer priorities for the academic year, clearer plans to move things forward, and clearer definitions of success across the organization.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

11. Additional Board-Approved Goals, Metrics, and Strategic Plan Objectives

Overall Assessment: Mixed to weak.

Stakeholder Perception Summary: The record indicates concern about the lack of a shared operational vision, limited communication about priorities, and uncertainty about success measures tied to system goals.

Key Strengths

- Some respondents acknowledge broad aspirations and an interest in improvement and growth.

Areas for Improvement

- Develop and share clearer metrics.
- Improve transparency around institutional priorities, budget implications, and expected outcomes.

Evidence Level: Strongly Supported.

Theme Analysis Across All Responses

The table below summarizes the frequency and overall sentiment direction of recurring themes identified across all qualitative responses. Frequency of mention reflects how often each theme was raised in stakeholder responses. Sentiment reflects the balance of positive versus negative framing within those mentions.

Theme	Frequency of Mention	Overall Sentiment	Supporting Evidence
Leadership effectiveness	High	Mixed	Frequently described as externally capable but internally inconsistent and shallow comprehension.
Transparency	High	Negative	Repeated calls for more openness about plans, priorities, spending, and expectations.
Communication	High	Mixed	Personal responsiveness is praised, but system-wide communication is often seen as unclear or inconsistent.
Strategic vision	High	Mixed	Vision is acknowledged, but execution and shared understanding are viewed as incomplete.
Collaboration	Medium to High	Mixed to Negative	Some see a collaborative approach, while others describe division.
Responsiveness	High	Positive	One of the most consistently cited strengths in direct interactions.
Trust and credibility	High	Mixed to Negative	Many comments reference distrust, disconnect, fear, or lack of confidence in internal management.
Relationship management	High	Positive externally; Mixed internally	Strong networking and external presence; weaker internal relationship cohesion.
Fiscal stewardship	Medium	Mixed to Negative	Concerns appear around hiring, consultants, open positions, and budget transparency.

Operational effectiveness	High	Negative	Repeated concerns about fragmentation, reactive management, and weak execution capacity.
Advocacy	Medium	Positive	External representation and community engagement are generally viewed favorably.
Governance	High	Mixed	Process understanding is a recurring concern.
Culture and morale	High	Negative	Frequent descriptions include distrust, division, fear, turnover, and working in survival mode.

Strengths Analysis

The most frequently mentioned strengths across the combined source materials are responsiveness, accessibility, external visibility, networking, relationship-building, personable, and willingness to engage directly with stakeholders. Some respondents also credit the Chancellor with trying to modernize operations, making thoughtful hires, building community connections, and bringing fundraising energy and outside-oriented strategic thinking to the role.

These strengths appear most salient among stakeholders who interact with the Chancellor directly or externally rather than through the day-to-day internal structure. Their organizational value lies in public representation, coalition-building, partner engagement, and the potential to expand resources and system visibility.

Improvement Opportunities

The most frequently cited improvement opportunities are stronger internal leadership presence, better understanding of the role of the Chancellor and system functions, more consistent and transparent communication, improved workplace culture, more effective use of institutional knowledge, stronger Board engagement, clearer strategic priorities, more decisive execution, and greater operational stability. The quantitative ratings support these concerns, especially in communication, leadership consistency, and the balance between internal and external responsibilities.

The additional comments sharpen the root-cause analysis. Stakeholders describe fragmented operations, new assignments arising before earlier work is complete, overconfidence in consultants, concern about policy adherence in hiring and firing, and an unresolved divide between executive staff, board staff, and other internal groups. These conditions may contribute to confusion, fatigue, distrust, and reduced system effectiveness.

Suggested actions based on the full record include establishing a formal leadership development or coaching plan, increasing regular in-office engagement, defining and communicating a limited set of strategic priorities, building a clear operating structure that links priorities to capacity, increasing transparency around budget and staffing decisions, involving long-tenured staff more intentionally, and strengthening direct communication and partnership with Regents.

Contradictions and Perception Gaps

One of the most important findings is the distinction between accessibility and effectiveness. Many respondents describe the Chancellor as easy to reach, responsive, and supportive in direct interactions, yet those same source materials contain widespread doubts about whether feedback is being translated into coherent organizational action. This suggests that interpersonal responsiveness is a genuine strength, but not a substitute for stable operational leadership.

A second perception gap emerges between the Chancellor's external and internal responsibilities. Some stakeholders tend to view his external leadership more favorably, citing his visibility, relationship-building efforts, and partnership-oriented approach. In contrast, assessments of his internal leadership are more likely to emphasize concerns about organizational stability, policy decisions, communication consistency, and workplace culture. This distinction helps explain how perceptions of both significant strengths and significant weaknesses can coexist within the same evaluation record.

Strategic Goal Performance Assessment

The record suggests that stakeholders generally believe the Chancellor has ideas, ambition, and some useful external instincts, but they are not yet confident that those strengths have been translated into a consistently executed system-wide strategy. Evidence of successful

implementation appears mainly in comments about outreach and relationship development rather than in comments about clear, measurable progress on priorities.

Perceived barriers include unclear success measures, weak internal operating structure, overextension across new initiatives, incomplete understanding of internal functions, and insufficient alignment between leadership aspirations and institutional execution capacity. Confidence in future success is mixed: some stakeholders believe the Chancellor is still learning a uniquely complex role and may improve with time, while others believe current leadership patterns are already causing operational and cultural strain that requires more immediate correction.

Final Evaluation Narrative

The Chancellor is viewed as a capable external representative of the system who brings energy, accessibility, and relationship-building skill to the role. He is frequently described as personable, responsive, and willing to engage with stakeholders, and some respondents believe he is trying in good faith to build capacity, modernize aspects of the organization, and positioning NSHE more effectively with outside audiences.

At the same time, the evaluation record raises substantial concerns about internal leadership effectiveness. The most consistent concerns involve insufficient focus on internal administrative responsibilities, incomplete role mastery, inconsistent communication, limited execution discipline, weak culture and trust, and a more-passive-than-expected leadership presence in Board settings. The quantitative findings reinforce these concerns by showing modest averages overall and the lowest scores in the area most directly tied to balancing internal leadership with external activity.

Taken together, the evidence supports an overall conclusion of mixed performance with stronger effectiveness in external relations than in internal organizational leadership. The Chancellor has identifiable assets that could support long-term success, but meaningful improvement is needed in governance engagement, organizational management, strategic clarity, and trust-building if those assets are to translate into stronger system-wide performance.

Overall Performance Summary and Key Takeaways for the Board of Regents

The combined qualitative and quantitative evidence indicates that the Chancellor's most recognized strengths are responsiveness, accessibility, external engagement, and relationship-building. The most significant concerns are internal leadership presence, operational understanding, culture and morale, communication consistency, Board engagement, and strategic execution.

The central Board-level takeaway is that stakeholder feedback does not primarily question effort or intent; rather, it questions whether the Chancellor is exercising the full leadership, management discipline, and governance presence required by the role. Development priorities should therefore focus on strengthening internal administration, clarifying strategic priorities, improving transparency, rebuilding trust, and demonstrating more direct leadership in both the System Office and Board settings.

Appendix

Qualitative Questions

1. How would you describe the Chancellor's understanding of his role and key responsibilities?
2. In what ways does the Chancellor effectively lead the organization? Where are there opportunities for improvement?
3. How would you characterize the Chancellor's communication style and effectiveness with different stakeholders (e.g., staff, executive team, Board)?
4. Can you provide examples of how the Chancellor has supported or hindered a positive workplace culture?
5. How effectively does the Chancellor balance internal management responsibilities with external commitments?
6. What impact, if any, has the Chancellor's external engagement had on organizational performance or operations?
7. How responsive is the Chancellor to feedback, concerns, or emerging issues within the system?
8. In your view, what are the Chancellor's greatest strengths as a leader?
In your view, what are the Chancellor's most significant leadership strengths at the system level?
9. What areas of performance or leadership would you most like to see improved?
What concerns, if any, do you have regarding the Chancellor's performance or leadership approach?
10. What recommendations would you offer to enhance the Chancellor's effectiveness moving forward?
11. How would you characterize the chancellor's engagement at meetings?

Signature Page

By signing below, you acknowledge receipt and understanding of this Chancellor Annual Evaluation report.

Matt McNair, Chancellor

Date

Byron Brooks, Board of Regents Chair

Date